

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2-30 and 32-40 are pending in the application. Claims 2-10, 12-20, 23-25, 30, 32-40 have been amended. Claims 2-30 and 32-40 accordingly remain pending in the application.

Claims 30 and 32-40 stand rejected under U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Keller, et al. Although Applicant has amended claim 30, the previous version of claim 30 and the current amended version are both believed patentably distinct over this reference. Applicant submits that Keller does not teach or suggest “monitoring the usage of resources by the two discovered components in the IT system *by receiving real-time messages*” (emphasis added). The Examiner may have misread the previous version of claim 30. Amended claim 30 recites “monitoring the usage of resources by the discovered components in the IT system by receiving real-time messages” (new language indicated). The Examiner, however, appears to have conflated this limitation and the preceding limitation, which is believed improper. Nonetheless, Applicant submits that the passages cited by the Examiner at pages 2-3 of the current Office Action do not teach or suggest the above-recited features of claim 30. The mere “identifi[cation]” of “dependencies” at “application install time” or “runtime” do not teach or suggest claim 30’s recitation of “receiving real-time messages.” With regard to the “MLM”s described at page 6, first and second paragraphs, although Keller refers to “event notification,” this reference does not refer to “real-time messages” as in claim 30. Because a reference must teach each and every limitation in order to anticipate a claim, Keller does not anticipate claim 30. Claim 30 and its dependent claims are therefore believed patentable over the cited art.

Claim 40 is believed patentably distinct over the cited art for at least the reasons stated for claim 30.

Claims 2-12 and 14-15 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kar, et al. Claim 13 stands rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kar, et al in view of Kathrow, et al. Claims 16-24 stand rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kathrow, in view of Kar, et al.

With regard to independent claim 5, the Examiner admits that Kar does not teach or suggest certain limitations of this claim. Applicant agrees. The Examiner alleges, however, that the missing limitations are found in Kathrow. Applicant disagrees. While Kathrow teaches

“hashing” in order to “identify whether differences exist between [two] files,” col. 2, lines 33-35, Kathrow says nothing about the use of “comparing at least the first component to one or more fingerprints, *wherein each fingerprint corresponds to a known component and includes one or more attributes that are a subset of attributes in a model of the known component*” (emphasis added). Kathrow certainly does not disclose a “model” of a “known component” as recited in claim 5, much less a “fingerprint” that “includes one or more attributes that are a subset of attributes in a model of the known component.” To make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must provide a teaching or suggestion in the prior art of each and every claim limitation. *See* MPEP § 2143.03. Here, the currently cited references cannot support such a showing, as certain features of claim 5 are missing from the cited art. Thus, even if Kar and Kathrow were combined as suggested by the Examiner, the resulting combination would not include all of the limitations of claim 5. For at least this reason, claim 5 and its dependent claims are believed patentable over the cited art.

Claims 13, 14, and 15 are believed patentably distinct over the cited art for at least the reasons stated for claims 5. Accordingly, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

With regard to claim 16, the Examiner relies on a proposed combination of Kathrow and Kar. Applicant strongly disagrees that Kathrow teaches anything regarding “discovering components” and “receiving event information,” as alleged by the Examiner at page 12 of the present Action. Previously, on page 11, the Examiner appears to admit that Kathrow is not even from the same art as claim 13, so it is unclear why Kathrow is now being used as the Examiner’s primary reference when it is quite different from the features recited in claim 16. In any event, as previously stated, Kathrow does not teach the use of a “fingerprint” as that term is used in claim 16. It follows, then, that Kathrow does not teach the use of the “subfingerprint” of claim 16. Claim 16 and its dependent claims are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 23, 24, 25, and 28 are believed patentably distinct over the cited art for at least the reasons stated for claims 5 and/or 16. Accordingly, these claims and their dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants also respectfully submit that numerous ones of the other dependent claims

recite further distinctions have been shown to be unsupported by the cited art, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time. Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments, if necessary, at a later date.

**CONCLUSION:**

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6002-07000/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 8, 2007

By: /Dean M. Munyon/  
Dean M. Munyon  
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P. O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(512) 853-8847